

[return to updates](#)

READING THE SIGNS

today's lesson: Karl Marx



by Miles Mathis

There aren't any communists. But scheming people must invent some malignant dangerous party. It's an old joke. —*Tolstoy*

First published November 23, 2014

[In a recent paper on the Paris Salon](#), I mentioned Marx in passing. I showed that the *New York Tribune* had been publishing Marx before the Civil War—which should have been surprising to us all. I have also recently linked the editor of the *New York Tribune*, Charles Dana, to US Intelligence. For more on that, see my [papers on Theosophy](#) and the [Cultural Cold War](#). Those two facts get us into the subject of this paper, that being, who *was* Karl Marx?

In those recent papers, I said that Marx himself may not have been using Marxism as a feint to fascism, but I now admit that I was just hedging. I hadn't yet done the research and didn't wish to get into it in those earlier papers. So I had to be content with showing that the US Government was indeed using Marxism as a precursor to fascism, and as a veil for it. Here we will go even deeper. I will be able to show you the clues unmasking Marx himself as an early European agent.

As usual, I will show you the way I got in, to make it easier for you to follow my method. If you have read my previous papers, you will know what I knew before I began researching this one, so start there. In those papers, we found that much of recent history had been faked or manufactured by the Intelligence agencies, which I have traced back to the 1830s. Of course US Intelligence predates that, but we won't need to go back that far in this paper.

What you *don't* know is that I had tripped across another series of red flags, which I had been poking at

without much final success for many months. In researching some of the actors involved in [the Manson event](#), I had stumbled across New Trier High School outside of Chicago. I dug a bit in that ground, finding first a strong link to Hollywood going back many decades, and then a weaker link leading into the wilderness, so to speak. Graduates of New Trier include Charlton Heston, Ann-Margret, Rock Hudson, Bruce Dern, and Hugh O'Brian (who just happened to run into Sharon Tate while [she was being interviewed](#) on Carnaby Street in London in 1966 by Merv Griffin—notice in that youtube link that Griffin asks O'Brian if he is CIA!). That is just a few of the many, *many* famous actors who attended New Trier High School.

Those who know that Marx was born in Trier, Germany, will understand the raw connection here, but for the others I will just say that we are going to take a longish detour before we get back to Marx. You may not understand what this high school in Chicago has to do with the title of the paper, but in a few pages you will. You will also be happy we took the detour, since you will probably learn many things you didn't already know.

New Trier high school is famous for producing actors, but it has produced many famous non-actors as well, including James McNerney, President/CEO of **GE**, **3M**, and **Boeing**. Also John Donohue, president of **eBay**; Chris Cox, VP of **Facebook**; Douglas Conant, President/CEO of **Campbell Soups**; Michael Rogers, director of the **NSA**; Donald Rumsfeld, **Secretary of Defense**; Martha Minow, Dean of Harvard Law; Rahm Emanuel, White House Chief of Staff; writer Scott Turow; poet Archibald MacLeish; the fake activist Brad Will; and the fake serial killer Benjamin Nathaniel Smith.



You will say, “So, it was a rich suburb of a very big city. These things happen.” Do they? To see if they do, let us follow just one of these people for a bit. Let's take the first one I mentioned, Charlton Heston. I wanted to just see if Heston was already living in that school district, or if he transferred in from somewhere. Guess what? The info has been scrubbed. Heston's biographers can't even agree on where he was born and raised, much less on where exactly he was living in his teens. Heston himself has said “he was not very good at remembering addresses or his early childhood.” [[Rick Schultz interview](#), 1996] Convenient. Go talk to some 70 year olds and see if they can't remember where they grew up. In the same interview, Heston said, “Since I have a strong mnemonic faculty, it was easy for me to slide through to the easy Bs [in school].” So he had a great memory—except for things like

where he grew up. He also said this: “The house I lived in my boyhood in Michigan, as far as I know, still stands, and it's a modest bungalow in the woods.” Hah. Last time I looked, North Chicago isn't in Michigan. And we are expected to believe that Heston went from being the son of a sawmill operator in the woods of Michigan to star pupil at New Trier in a wealthy suburb of Chicago? How did he afford that? Daddy must have sawed a mighty big load of lumber, oh boy. In 1912, New Trier was the first high school in the nation to have an indoor swimming pool. By the late 1930s—when Heston was supposed to be there—it was richer still. You will say that was after the Great Depression, but only the poor got poorer in the Depression. As now, the rich got richer.

You will say New Trier was always a public high school, not a private one, so he didn't have to pay anything. But if it was public, he had to live in the district, which was for *very* wealthy people. It didn't allow free transfers from the woods of Michigan.

Heston's bio is full of red flags like this. After college, Heston went into the Air Force. But he didn't go in until the war was almost over, in 1944. He would have been 18 in 1941, so how did he dodge the draft? He wasn't married then, and I don't remember reading about any deferment for drama scholarship winners. Well, Wikipedia tells us, though it doesn't tell us it is telling us:

Heston narrated for highly [classified](#) military and [Department of Energy](#) instructional films, particularly relating to [nuclear weapons](#), and “for six years Heston [held] the nation's highest security clearance” or [Q clearance](#).” The Q clearance is similar to a [DoD](#) or [Defense Intelligence Agency](#)(DIA) clearance of [Top Secret](#).^[21]

OK, so now we are getting somewhere. That was from 1947 to 1953. 1947 was year-one of the CIA. Heston was obviously in some cadre of military intelligence. And he had been in it prior to 1947. In 1944, he had been sent to the Aleutians as a radio operator. That is Alaska. There was no war in Alaska in 1944. The “Aleutian campaign” with the Japanese ended in 1943. So was Heston even there? It is doubtful, since the army would have no use for an actor in Alaska in 1944-5.

But the point is made: Heston's early bio, including his time at New Trier, is a series of red flags. Given that Heston's bio includes this admitted top-security clearance, and given that New Trier also graduated Rumsfeld, Rogers, McNerney, and Emanuel, we already see the pattern. Something is going on at New Trier that we aren't being told.

And if we study Donald Rumsfeld's bio, we discover something else interesting about *Heston*. Although Heston's page doesn't mention it, Rumsfeld's page mentions that he went to Baker Demonstration School. If we take the link to that, we find that Heston also went there. This was a school up to 8th grade, so Heston must have already been in the Winnetka area well before high school. Seeing that Heston must have been in this super wealthy neighborhood by the time he was 11 or 12, it is somewhat surprising he has no memory of it.

[Added December 2016: a genealogy check of Heston sends up a flurry of red flags as well. We are told his real name was John Carter. What, like John Carter of Mars? His parents alleged divorced when he was 10 and his mother remarried a Heston. But if his dad was still alive and he was already ten why would he take his stepfather's name? We aren't told he was adopted, so this looks like another fake story. We find the same strangeness with his mother's name. We are told she was nee Charlton, but it was actually *her mother* who was nee Charlton. She was a Baines. They were probably hiding the Baines name to keep us from linking Heston to Lyndon Baines Johnson. So we are supposed to believe Heston is named for his maternal grandmother and his stepfather. Very unlikely. Heston was

also a Clark. His other grandmother was a Clark. Since Heston's wife was a Clarke, he may have married a close cousin. She has no genealogy posted at Geni. However, [Rootsweb tells us](#) she was the daughter of Lennox Barrett Clarke and Lydia Lenore Schaper. That last name is interesting, since we saw it in my paper on the [Engels and Owen](#). See Hermann Schaper, an alleged Nazi allegedly sentenced to six years for Holocaust atrocities, but soon released for medical reasons. All documentation of his trial has since been destroyed. Schaper/Schapper is a Jewish name. The Clarkes are also prominent in these hoaxes of the past centuries, and we have seen them over and over in previous papers, linked to crypto-Jewish lines. In support of that, we find Heston was also a Wolfe. His grandmother Beatrice Clark's grandmother was Nancy Jane Wolfe. Yet another one of the families. She married a Cannady, which is a variant of Kennedy. I suspect Heston was also related to the Kennedys and they are hiding it with this spelling.

But let's return to Lennox Clarke above. [We find him listed in an old obituary](#) at the *Herald Times Reporter* (Two Rivers), Sept. 4, 1973. He was the son of Finch Clarke. We also find that his daughter Lydia Heston's sister married a William Nash. That links us to the Nash family—see my paper on [John Forbes Nash](#). Lydia's brother Robert B. Clarke is also mentioned, as a Colonel in the US European Command.

To check any links to Baines, let's do a quick peek at LBJ's genealogy. His mother's paternal grandparents are scrubbed at Geni, which is very strange for a US President. They aren't even scrubbed at the LBJ Presidential Library, given as George Washington Baines and Melissa Ann Butler. But her maternal line is Huffman. They probably should have scrubbed that, since they admit it was previously Hoffman. Likely Jewish. We get Webbs on the Johnson side, going back to the prominent Virginia Webbs and before that to Gloucestershire and William Micajah Webb. Note the middle name. He was married to a Tucker. If we keep going back we come to the Webbs who were Stratford knights, related to the Shakespeares and Ardens. There are many Baines in the peerage, including Lazarus Baines. They are related to the Talbots and Fitzroys. The Talbots link us to the Howards, Dukes of Norfolk, extremely prominent in the 17th century.]

That was informative, so let's do another one. Bruce Dern, famous actor and father of actress Laura Dern, was the grandson of Roosevelt's Secretary of War George Dern. That of course links him to Rumsfeld, who was also Secretary of War (under Bush). Our understanding of New Trier is starting to jell.



Dern's godfather was Adlai Stevenson, Jr., who was governor of Illinois and Presidential nominee in

1952. Stevenson's father had been Vice President under Grover Cleveland.




[Hugh O'Brian as Wyatt Earp. See [my more recent paper](#) outing Wyatt Earp and the OK Corral as another Intel project.]

Now let us return to Hugh O'Brian, who, if you will remember, ran into Sharon Tate and Merv Griffin during a live interview in London in 1966. Merv jokingly asked Hugh if he was CIA (because Hugh seemed to be stalking them or spying on them, I guess). Turns out, Hugh probably *was* CIA. His dad was a career Marine, but we aren't told his final rank. After New Trier, O'Brian went to the Roosevelt Military Academy. He enlisted in the Marines in 1943, and we are told he became the first 17-year-old drill instructor. Since drill instructors are normally Sergeants (E5), most Marines will find that curious. Also curious is that by 1948, O'Brian was already in Los Angeles appearing in major films. In that year O'Brian had a bit part in *Kidnapped*, starring Roddy McDowell as David Balfour. That's a quick transition from Marine drill instructor to successful actor. O'Brian would have been only 22 when the film shot. Another red flag is that O'Brian is said to have been discovered by Ida Lupino. Lupino also has CIA markers all over her, *especially in 1948*. Although she had appeared in many pictures in the 1930s and 40s, in the mid-40s she suddenly stopped acting to write and direct "low-budget, issue-oriented films". Although she was British and didn't need US citizenship, she was given it in 1948. That date itself is a red flag, since that is when the CIA was doing a full-court press on Hollywood. The subject of Lupino's first film *Never Fear* was polio, which is curious seeing that Roosevelt had polio. It appears the CIA was trying to spin Roosevelt's still-recent death (1945). If that doesn't make something click in your head, try this:



That is the poster from Lupino's third film *Outrage*. If you haven't already, I encourage you to read my recent papers on the [Zodiac](#), [Manson](#), and [Ted Bundy](#). Then return to this paper. You will see that the CIA has been trying to scare everyone, but especially women. This is the way they do it. It is called *in-your-face* propaganda. **Is Any Girl SAFE?**

Lupino's second film *Not Wanted* has been scrubbed from Wikipedia, so we have to go to IMDB to find this lovely poster:




You can tell that is propaganda without further commentary from me.

Here's something else strange about Lupino: [we are told she was a Lieutenant](#) during WWII in the **Women's Ambulance and Defense Corps of America**.



Problem? She wasn't a citizen until 1948. You can't become a lieutenant in the US Military without being a citizen. So she was just a pretend lieutenant.

I will be told non-citizens can enlist. Yes, [but they can't become lieutenants](#). “Federal law prohibits non-citizens from becoming commission or warrant officers.” *A lieutenant is a commissioned officer*. As a Brit during the war, Lupino would have had to join the British Ambulance Corp.



But let's move on to another New Trier graduate. Archibald MacLeish spent a short time at New Trier. If you don't know, MacLeish was a famous modernist poet, found in all the anthologies. He was in your *Norton Anthology* in college. More important here is his early connection to the Paris Salon, Gertrude Stein, Ernest Hemingway, Ezra Pound and that lot. I have outed all those folks in my paper called [“The Stolen Century”](#). The website [cia.gov](#) admits Hemingway worked for them; and the literary magazines were outed by the CIA back in the late 1960s, as I show in my papers on [The CIA and Modern Art](#) and on [Ramparts magazine](#).

MacLeish was Skull and Bones at Yale. He then went to Harvard Law, where he was the editor of the Law Review. He practiced law for three years afterwards. Save us from lawyers turned poets!

Not only did MacLeish attend New Trier, he also attended [the Hotchkiss School](#), another prep school that seeds the Intelligence agencies. Peter Matthiessen also attended Hotchkiss, and he finally admitted he was a CIA agent. Wikipedia now includes that information in the first sentence on his page there. Henry Ford went to Hotchkiss, as did Henry Luce, the founder of TIME magazine. So did Lewis Lapham, editor of *Harper's* magazine.† So did Thomas Hoving, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.* So did John Hersey, Pulitzer-prize-winning journalist who wrote the account of the Hiroshima aftermath.** So did Roswell Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense under Kennedy. So did the members of Sha Na Na. So did Tom Werner, who brought you *The Cosby Show*, *Roseanne*, *3rd Rock from the Sun*, and *That 70s Show*.

We are told that MacLeish's dad was “a dry good merchant”. Hah. He was a bit more than that. Since

he has [his own Wiki page](#), he must have done pretty well as a merchant. He was one of the wealthiest men in Chicago, and founded the University of Chicago along with John D. Rockefeller. If you want to know why Archibald MacLeish got famous, it is due to his connections, not due to his lousy poetry.

As just a sample for proof of that, here are the first two stanzas from his famous poem “Two Poems from the War”:

Oh, not the loss of the accomplished thing!
Not dumb farewells, nor long relinquishment
Of beauty had, and golden summer spent,
And savage glory of the fluttering
Torn banners of the rain, and frosty ring
Of moon-white winters, and the imminent
Long-lunging seas, and glowing students bent
To race on some smooth beach the gull's wing:

Not these, nor all we've been, nor all we've loved,
The pitiful familiar names, had moved
Our hearts to weep for them; but oh, the star
The future is! Eternity's too wan
To give again that undefeated, far,
All-possible irradiance of dawn.

What kind of non-artist would *start* a poem with “Oh, not the loss of the accomplished thing!”? Could you possibly throw your reader more quickly into meaningless blather? “The accomplished thing”? That simply isn't poetic language. Reading that, I feel like I have just fallen into a vat of tepid jello. And what are “torn banners of the rain”? Does the rain have banners?

But the second stanza is even worse. MacLeish tells us that we hadn't been moved to weep for all we had lost in war. Why not? I should think we *had been* moved to weep for them, and if we hadn't, we would be unlikely to be moved to weep by some squishy poem. He tells us that though we hadn't been moved to weep for the “glowing students” (now riddled with bullet holes, I guess), or for golden summers or beauty lost, **but oh, the star the future is!** What? What does that have to do with anything? What does it even mean? Does he mean that any mention of the future by a bad poet is supposed to outweigh all the death and loss and destruction?

Eternity's too wan to give again that undefeated, far, all-possible irradiance of dawn.

Again, what? The only thing I can figure is that MacLeish is trying to push an internal rhyme of *wan* with *dawn*, but to do it he is forced to write a sentence that is gibberish. And he has just mightily contradicted himself. He has just told us *what a star the future is*, which implies brightness, I would think. But then “Eternity”—which is sort of a blobby restatement or synonym for the “the future”—is now *too wan*. If Eternity is so pale and uncertain, then how is the future a star? And if Eternity is so pale and uncertain, how does that move us to weep for the things we have lost when we weren't already weeping for them?

Put simply, this isn't poetry by any stretch of anyone's imagination. It isn't even prose. It is an insensible throwing together of words by someone with only a marginal understanding of what they mean. MacLeish was sold as a poet only because he was promoted by these wealthy businessmen, for their own ends.

What were those ends? Amazingly, Wikipedia tells us:

Archibald MacLeish also assisted with the development of the new "[Research and Analysis Branch](#)" of the [Office of Strategic Services](#), the precursor to the [Central Intelligence Agency](#). . . . Academic specialists from fields ranging from [geography](#) to [classical philology](#) descended upon Washington, bringing with them their most promising graduate students, and set up shop in the headquarters of the Research and Analysis (R&A) Branch at Twenty-third and E Streets, and in the new annex to the Library of Congress. During [World War II](#) MacLeish also served as director of the [War Department's Office of Facts and Figures](#) and as the assistant director of the [Office of War Information](#). These jobs were heavily involved with propaganda, which was well-suited to MacLeish's talents.

That's kind of a strange job for a premier poet, don't you think? Why does Intelligence need to be recruiting poets and philologists, and annexing itself to the Library of Congress? But there's more:

Despite a long history of debate over the merits of [Marxism](#), MacLeish came under fire from anti-communists in the 1940s and 1950s, including [J. Edgar Hoover](#) and [Joseph McCarthy](#). Much of this was due to his involvement with left-wing organizations like the [League of American Writers](#), and to his friendships with prominent [left-wing](#) writers.

After reading Frances Stonor Saunders [*The Cultural Cold War*] and my recent papers, you should know how to decode that. Someone forgot to inform McCarthy that MacLeish and all these other people were faux-leftists, manufactured by Intelligence. The left had been infiltrated and co-opted long before WWII. All these literary magazines had been started or taken over by Intelligence, including MacLeish's *New Republic*. These guys weren't promoting Marxism, or even discussing it honestly. They were always spinning and misdirecting. *Always*.



Next let's look at Benjamin Nathaniel Smith, who is said to have killed or wounded 12 people in a shooting spree in 1999. The New Trier high school page says Smith was an alumnus, but his own page says he lived in Kenosha, Wisconsin, and went to high school there. His page can't seem to decide if his total casualty was 11 or 12, since it tells us both. It also tells us Smith shot himself twice in the head before crashing the car he was driving. He survived and had to shoot himself again in the heart. Right. He is said to have wounded nine Orthodox Jews in West Rogers Park. OK. They really need to

hire some better scriptwriters, and a continuity proofer.



Smith was linked to Matthew Hale, the Pontifex Maximus of *Creativity*, a neo-religion that promoted racial hatred. Hale is said to be serving a 40-year sentence for solicitation to murder a judge. Like the Smith plot, the entire Hale plot is manufactured; and although Hale is said to be incarcerated at ADX Florence in Colorado, he isn't. ADX maximum security prison has a fake wing, filled with fictional characters like Zacharias Moussaoui (20th 911 hijacker), Richard Reid (shoe bomber), Umar Abdulmutallab (underwear bomber), and other fake terrorists. It also houses other ghosts like Ted Kaczynski ([Unabomber](#)), Terry Nichols (Oklahoma City bombing), Eric Rudolph (Olympic Park bombing), Robert Hanssen (FBI spy), and various organized crime and Aryan Brotherhood actors like Tyler Bingham, Thomas Silverstein, and James Marcello. See [here](#) for full list of fake inmates. And see my [paper on the Manson event](#) for proof the Aryan Brotherhood is a fake.

I could go on all day researching New Trier graduates, but let us move on. New Trier links itself in its own literature to the ancient town Trier in Germany, which is strange enough. Stranger still is the emblem used by the high school:



That's the Porta Nigra, which is also the emblem of Trier in Germany. It is a famous gate of the city, and the site is said to date back before the founding of Rome. The name means “the Black Gate.” Cue *Twilight Zone* music.

Just imagine if your high school had an emblem like that, with a Black Gate on it. You would wonder what *in hell* was going on, wouldn't you? Well, the weird symbols don't stop there. Look more

closely, and you will notice that the emblem is surrounded by an asymmetrical wreath. It is different on one side than the other, isn't it? Why? It appears to have 9 oak leaves on one side and 18 fronds on the other. Why? I will be told it is because there are six and then six and then six fronds, or 666. Indicating this is the Black Gate of hell. I dismissed that reading the first time it popped into my head. As you know, I have dismissed the Satanic overtones of all the manufactured events as misdirection. I still do that, although I have to admit it is getting harder to do. We will leave the question open and simply see where the research takes us.

We now follow the scent to Trier itself. This is where we link back up to Marx. Karl Marx is said to have been born in Trier. The first time I read that, I dismissed it as a coincidence, but I no longer do. You will see why in a moment. But before we get there, let us take a look at the history of Trier. It is surpassingly strange, even for an old European city. Formerly called Treves, the city is claimed to have been founded 1,300 years before Rome. That would be 2,056 BC, and would make Trier the oldest town in Germany and one of the oldest in Europe. Even the recorded history of Athens doesn't go back that far. That would take us back almost to the Old Kingdom in Egypt.

Stranger still is the link to Assyria. Not many towns in Europe trace themselves back to Assyria. For instance, Rome—which is of course quite old—traces its founding to Aeneas, and through him back to Troy (c. 1300 BC). Troy is somewhat to the East, now being in far western Turkey, but Assyria is much further to the East, being north of Babylon, in present-day Iraq. Why would Trier wish to link itself to Assyria? According to the history, Trier was founded by Trebeta, son of Ninus. Ninus was Nimrod from the Bible, who taught the Persians to worship fire. Note that. Ninus was the son of Belus, who—according to Castor of Rhodes—lived when Zeus was fighting the Titans. In fact, theogony gets mixed up with history at this distance in the past, since another historian—John of Nikiu—tells us that the pagan gods Cronus and Rhea were real Assyrians, and that they bore Zeus (aka Picus) and his brother Ninus. If Ninus was a god like his brother Zeus, then of course his son Trebeta would also be a god. So according to some of these old monks cataloging these stories, Germany was colonized by pagan gods.

In one way, that doesn't take much believing, since we can see why monks would wish to trace their lineage back to gods. It is less clear why Christian monks like John of Nikiu would wish to trace themselves to pagan gods. John was an Egyptian Coptic bishop, so we have two questions instead of one: 1) why would a Christian bishop wish to trace his lineage back to pagan gods? 2) why would an Egyptian Coptic bishop wish to tie his lineage to Assyria or Persia? Egypt had a history just as old or older, so if he has to trace himself back to someone other than Adam, why not trace himself to Ra or Set or Amun?

An even better question, perhaps, is why German Christian monks would wish to tie Trier to Assyria via these fire-worshipping demi-deities from the East. A clue is given by the fact that Trebeta was said to have been cremated at his death by the people of Trier on a great pyre. Again, that is neither a Christian, a Semitic, an Egyptian, a Greek, nor a Babylonian practice. Cremation was prohibited by all these cultures/religions for most or all of their history.

I will leave that great mystery hanging for now and return you to Marx. Marx's history—unlike that of Charlton Heston—is well-known and uncontested, but it is rarely stressed. They like to rush you by it, if they mention it at all. You will now see why. On his father's side, Marx came from a family of

rabbis. His father was the first in the line to refuse that road and instead he became a rich lawyer. [Fortunately he didn't also become a poet, as far as we know.] His father gave up Judaism, we are told, and became a Lutheran, although we must assume that was just a pose. He married a Jewish woman anyway, and although we are always told she was “semi-literate,” the more important fact is that she was connected to a family of *very* wealthy bankers and industrialists. This was the Philips family, which later started Philips electronics. Outside of the royals, the Philips were and still are the richest people in Belgium.

[Marx's mother was actually a Pressburg, and it was her sister who married into the Philips family. However, the Pressburgs were *also* very wealthy Jewish merchants. If they hadn't been prominent they wouldn't have been able to marry into the Philips family. Their line in Holland was actually relatively new, and just a couple of generations earlier they had moved from Austria-Hungary, where they had also been wealthy and influential. Their extended family includes many bankers and—like Marx's family—rabbis. See the names Hartog, Isaacs, Barent-Cohen, and Brandeis. Yes, *that* Brandeis.]

I want to pause and circle that “semi-literate” tag we get whenever we read about Marx's mother. It is supposed to divert you from realizing who she really is. Being semi-literate implies she is from a low-class family of scullery maids or something, when the truth is she is from a family of millionaires. They just trust you don't make the connection I did, going “so these millionaires are semi-literate?” I encourage you to make that connection, because it explains a lot. For a start, it explains why these super-wealthy families who now run the world care nothing for real art, literature, poetry, or music. They have destroyed all the old high arts and sciences, keeping only the lowly economics. The upper class they displaced—the real aristocrats—always honored art and artists. They scoured their domains—even the countryside and the towns of the poor—searching for the most talented artisans and artists. But the *nouveau-riche* industrialists killed that tradition, instead inserting their own talentless children into the all the artistic venues and jobs.

[A reader wrote in to send me [to Wikitree](#), which is less scrubbed than Geni regarding Marx. Geni scrubs Marx's genealogy before we can make a link to the Rothschilds, but Wikitree doesn't. Wikitree makes it easy to see that Karl Marx's grandmother Nanette Barent-Cohen⁶ was the first cousin of Henriette Barent-Cohen, who married Nathan Mayer Rothschild. Wow. This indicates it wasn't just the Phillips and Pressburgs bankrolling the Communism project, it was the even deeper pockets of Rothschild.]

We also have curious links through Marx's wife Jenny:

Spending summer and autumn 1836 in Trier, Marx became more serious about his studies and his life. He became engaged to [Jenny von Westphalen](#), an educated baroness of the Prussian ruling class who had known Marx since childhood. Having broken off her engagement with a young aristocrat to be with Marx, their relationship was socially controversial due to the differences between their ethnic and class origins, but Marx befriended her father, a liberal aristocrat, [Ludwig von Westphalen](#), and later dedicated his doctoral thesis to him.

No one ever asks how Marx managed to meet and wed an educated baroness of the Prussian ruling class. Being a middle-class Jew, son of an attorney, he should have been the worst possible husband for her. We would expect her family to do everything possible to prevent such a union. This is glossed over by telling us Jenny and Karl were childhood friends, but that is beyond belief. Jenny's father Ludwig von Westphalen may have hired Karl's father Heinrich to do some work for him, but as for the families socializing, that is next to impossible. Plus, Jenny was four years older. If we are to believe

that they became friends as children, we would have to believe that a 16-year-old girl, say, became close friends with a 12-year-old boy. It doesn't happen that way. If you are male, ask yourself if you had any female friends that were four years older, when you were 10 or 12. You didn't. A 16-year-old girl would be interested in a 20-year-old boy, not a 12-year-old. Jenny would have to be slow for us to believe she was best friends with a much younger boy, but she wasn't. She was supposed to be beautiful—the most beautiful girl in Trier‡—and highly educated.

The marriage looks *arranged* to me, for political purposes, which means Ludwig was probably in on the con. In other words, the most logical reading of the clues here is that Ludwig von Westphalen was an aristocrat who had been bought out by the rising industrialists like the Philips family. He had read the signs, seeing the ultimate victory of money over rank—banking over the aristocracy—and he had chosen their side. The history books call Ludwig a liberal aristocrat, which I suppose means he was open to new ideas for the future. But since the new idea for the future he was open to was this takeover by the bankers and industrialists, he was anything but liberal. To use the right adjective, he was a *fascist*.

His links to the government in Prussia also explain the protection Marx seemed to have there, even as he was being ejected from Germany more than once. His counterpart in Russia, Bakunin, spent many years in prison, but Marx was never inconvenienced. Even after Ludwig died in 1842, Jenny still had connections to the aristocracy through her family.

But there is another possibility, one that would free Ludwig from any blame. It is possible that all we are told about Ludwig is false. It is possible that Ludwig opposed the marriage violently, as we would expect him to. *It is possible that Jenny was the one bought out by the industrialists.* This reading should appeal to feminists, since it gives her a far greater role in this entire history. It is possible that both Marx and Jenny were agents, and that *she*, not he, was their main tool against the aristocracy in Germany. Just think how useful a turned Prussian baroness would be to the bankers and industrialists. All they needed was one rich girl who hated Daddy for whatever reason, and they would have their perfect spy. If she was a bit of an actress, so much the better.

The clue leading us to this reading of the facts is that Marx and Jenny didn't wed until *after* Ludwig died. He died in 1842 and they wed in 1843. We are told they had a 7-year engagement, so they apparently waited a long time for Ludwig to pass on.

[For more on Jenny Marx, see [my more recent paper on her](#).]

At any rate, we know Marx's mom was from a family of millionaires (by today's standards). And his wife was a baroness whose grandfather had been chief of staff to Duke Ferdinand of Brunswick. This Duke is interesting for several reasons. The first is that he was a field marshal, which is basically a five-star general. That is and was extremely rare. The second is that he was almost made the commander of the *British* forces in the *American Revolutionary War*. So this is who Jenny's family was accustomed to work for and socialize with. This Duke was also a millionaire, and the Westphalens were also very wealthy. And yet the historians tell us Marx was living hand-to-mouth at several points. They tell us that Karl and Jenny relied on loans from the family; and that after his father died, Marx's family had a “diminished income.” And that Karl and Jenny lived communally in Paris with the Ruges. You might want to ask these fake historians how stupid they think you are. How could Karl and Jenny ever have any money problems? They didn't need loans from their own family. They were never disinherited, so they had almost infinite supplies of money. Millionaires and baronesses don't live communally in one-room flop houses. They are selling you the same kind of manufactured [story](#)

[they sold you with Hemingway](#) and the others in the lost generation. We are told these rich kids were living close to the bone—always a day away from begging on the street—when the fact is they were trust-fund kids, always just one letter or phonecall away from a bag of cash.

The mainstream hasn't just missed this fact, it has buried it on purpose. No, even burying is not a strong enough word for it. Mainstream historians and journalists have lied right to your face. See this [2010 article from the DailyMail](#), telling us that when Marx died he was worth less than \$400. Since we are never told that either Marx's family or Jenny's ever cut them off or disinherited them, that is impossible. Marx was from money and married money, so I would assume he died a millionaire.

So you see, we have red flags popping up with Marx from the beginning. When you read that Marx's uncle was a super-wealthy banker and industrialist, don't you get a little suspicious? Don't you wonder if maybe, just maybe, these bankers financed this whole literary and philosophical operation for a reason? In fact, it is admitted that this banker uncle Benjamin Philips *did* bankroll Marx while he was in London. But he was bankrolling him before that. Marx wasn't working in Paris, so we may assume he was a trust-fund boy all along. In fact, it looks like Marx was sent to Paris as an agent, specifically to follow Arnold Ruge: to spy on him and undermine him.

By that time Marx was already arguing that the proletariat was a revolutionary force. Do you think Uncle Benny the banker was underwriting this project, hoping that the proletariat would revolt and overthrow the industrialists? No, Uncle Benny was underwriting this project for the express purpose of *preventing* that from happening. The growing socialist movement—which was closely allied at that time to the Republican revolutions fomenting all over the world—was seen as a danger to the rich. Marx was trained and sent in to splinter and disorient this movement, which he did.

I will be told Uncle Benny didn't know what Marx was doing. Benny just sent money to support his nephew Marx because he was a generous guy. Right. Marx was ejected twice from Germany by the King of Prussia, and then from two other countries, but Benny didn't know that? Marx was notorious throughout the civilized world, but Benny didn't read the papers?

[If you don't believe me, remember that Tolstoy admitted it. See *Anna Karenina*, Part III, Ch. XXI, where he has General Serpukhovskoi say “There aren't any communists. But scheming people must invent some malignant dangerous party. It's an old joke.” That's pretty clear, I would say. And in context, we see that Tolstoy is not belittling that opinion. The General is not being presented as some sort of idiot. Also remember the name of the central character in *Anna Karenina*, other than Anna herself: **Levin**. Tolstoy admitted that the character was largely autobiographical, and that is easy to see regardless. Tolstoy's first name is Lev, you know, not Leo, so the fact he is now known as Leo in the Western world is strange in itself. Well, Levin is a Jewish name, and the character is from a noble family. So not only is Tolstoy all but admitting he himself is from Jewish roots, he is admitting many Russian noble families are Jewish. This confirms my analysis in [my later paper on Lenin](#), where I show *all* of the ruling families at the time of the fake Russian Revolution were Jewish, including the Romanovs. Also check the crest on the cover of *Anna Karenina* and other first editions of Tolstoy. It is a two-headed eagle. Except that I have previously shown you that isn't an eagle. It is a phoenix. Giving us the stamp of the Phoenicians.]

I won't have time to do it for you here, but I encourage you to reread all Marx's major writings with that idea in mind. Marx was sent in to control the opposition. Notice how at every juncture, Marx manages to create factions rather than alliances. He deftly prevents any real action by always turning the socialists against themselves. He keeps them arguing over philosophical fine-points rather than

encouraging direct and immediate action. Wikipedia even admits it:

In *Vorwärts!*, Marx refined his views on socialism based upon Hegelian and Feuerbachian ideas of dialectical materialism, at the same time criticising liberals and other socialists operating in Europe.^[65]

See, he is not creating alliances, he is criticizing liberals and other socialists. He is encouraging infighting. And at the same time he is weighing the movement down with a big bag of useless and imprecise terms like dialectical materialism. This is perfect legal misdirection, which he learned from his father. As a lawyer, his father knew that one of the best tools at your disposal as an agent of disinfo is a monstrous lingo, with which you can insert confusion into any argument.

As another quick example, look at his book *Die heilige Familie* (*The Holy Family*), which he wrote with Engels in 1844. Not only does the book rudely dismiss the Young Hegelians—who we are told gave Marx his start a decade earlier—but he tries to push a group whose radicalism had failed to even more radicalism. Although the suppression of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher* in 1843 had already killed the Young Hegelians (Marx was basically kicking a man when he was down), Marx's solution was that the Young Hegelians hadn't been radical *enough*. Although Bruno Bauer—foremost Young Hegelian—had been writing the most anti-Christian pamphlets ever seen in Germany, Marx and Engels accused him of only being a Christian *reformer*—hence the term “holy”. They even called him Saint Bruno.

This was vicious, seeing that Bruno had been best friends with Marx just three years earlier.

In July [1841], Marx and Bauer took a trip to Bonn from Berlin. There they scandalised their class by getting drunk, laughing in church, and galloping through the streets on donkeys. [Wheen, p. 34]

In short, the leaders of the progressive movement in Germany had already cut their own throats by focusing on religion instead of politics. Most workers weren't interested in overthrowing the Church. Atheism was a pose mostly taken by university students, not by workers. The masses weren't going to be swayed by talking to them about atheism, and Marx knew that. These attacks on Christianity only turned most of the workers off. But the leaders of the progressive movements like Bauer were too ensconced in their ivory towers to see that. So Marx and Engels cleverly goaded them into thinking they had failed because they *hadn't gone far enough* in their attacks on religion. Marx's job was to push the progressives into further radicalism, a radicalism that would both disenchant the real workers and mobilize the conservatives in government to shut down the magazines and meetings. The same sort of controlling the opposition we see now was going on in the 1840s. There are many subplots to this control, but one of them has always been encouraging the progressives to play their hand too far and too early. Marx was inserted as a mole: a creator of dissension, a confuser, and a giver of bad advice.

We see more proof of that in 1849 when August Willich and Karl Schapper recommended an immediate uprising. Marx and Engels did everything they could to stop it, warning that it would be crushed by the police.

Changes in society, Marx argued, are not achieved overnight through the efforts and will power of “a handful of men.” [Fedoseyev, p. 233] Instead, they are brought about through a scientific analysis of economic conditions of society and by moving toward revolution through different stages of social development.

That is classical Marxist misdirection, of course, with the blather about a scientific progression of

history. It also refutes itself for at least two reasons: 1) Willich and Schapper weren't calling for action by a handful of men, they were calling for action by *millions* of men and women simultaneously across Europe—the very thing the industrialists feared most. 2) The industrialists *had* changed society in a matter of decades, and they were in fact “a handful of men.” A few powerful people working together can achieve incredible things, and history is full of examples of that. Marx and his backers knew that, which is exactly why they were publishing manifestoes saying the opposite.

I encourage you to study that last quoted sentence closely. Here it is again: Instead, they are brought about through a scientific analysis of economic conditions of society and by moving toward revolution through different stages of social development. When did anything in history ever happen that way? Answer: it didn't. The French Revolution happened in just the opposite way, with no scientific analysis of economic conditions and no moving through stages of social development. The 17th century overthrow of Charles by Cromwell didn't happen that way, either. Both real history and human nature are the opposite of scientific. They are the opposite of Marxist.

As more evidence of this, I beg you to reconsider Marx's pitting the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. This should have always seemed strange to you, seeing that the great enemy of the worker was not the bourgeoisie, but the very rich industrialists who owned the companies. As now, it was the super rich that were preying on the workers, not the middle class. The lower class and the middle class should have been natural allies against the upper class, since both were and are being preyed upon mercilessly. Well, the upper class recognized that fact, and had to prevent that alliance by any means possible. Enter Karl Marx.

Do you really think it is a coincidence that Marx came from a family of super wealthy industrialists, and that he was misdirecting attention away from them all along? You will tell me that when he returned to Cologne in 1848, he pressed four of the ten points of the Manifesto, believing that “the bourgeoisie must overthrow the *feudal* monarchy and aristocracy before the proletariat could overthrow the bourgeoisie.” [Wheen, p. 129.] But again, that is misdirection, since his rich uncle Benny was *neither* monarchy nor aristocracy. The Philips family was composed of bankers and industrialists, not aristocrats. In fact, these industrialists wanted to supplant the existing aristocracy. It was upper class versus upper class, and in some parts of the world it still is. Remind yourself what happened in Russia: the monarchy and aristocracy were overthrown, but not by the bourgeoisie. They were overthrown by a group of mysterious intellectuals like Marx—Lenin, Trotsky, etc.—and under closer examination we find they too were financed by *bankers and industrialists*.

I encourage you to read that last quoted sentence yet again, and despise it like this: Marx wanted to see the bourgeoisie overthrow the aristocracy *before* the proletariat overthrew the bourgeoisie. Why would he push that idea? I suggest to you that it is because the overthrow of the aristocracy was the plan all along. All this talk about the proles and bourgeoisie is just misdirection. The goal was for the aristocracy to be replaced by the industrialists in Marx's family, after which the proletariat could all go get hanged. Marx and his backers knew that the proletariat would never gain the ability to overthrow anyone, but they especially wouldn't have the power to overthrow a new upper class that had just defeated the old aristocracy and co-opted all their resources.

You see, recent history has been the industrialists against everyone else. But they were always least worried about the “proletariat.” The lower class was mostly lower for a reason. They had the fewest resources, intellectual and tangible. That is why the industrialists were always misdirecting you *toward* them. They wanted the world to *think* they were concerned with the lower classes, but they weren't. They were most concerned with the aristocracy, since the aristocracy had all the things they

wanted. This is why Marx was advising that the aristocracy needed to be overthrown first. He is actually tipping his hand toward us here, but almost no one has read the cards right.

The secondary concern of the industrialists and bankers was the upper-middle class. They had to watch their flank while they were going after the aristocracy. They couldn't have those just beneath them bite them in the butt while they were pulling down kings. In hindsight, we see that they dealt with this by pushing a materialistic and economic worldview. This materialistic worldview kept the upper-middle class chasing the very wealthy above them, rather than attacking them. The middle class didn't want to ally itself to the lower class, since that would just pull them down. This effectively isolated the lower class. It also isolated and ultimately doomed the middle class, since after the industrialists had defeated the aristocracy, they turned and attacked the stratum just beneath them. The new upper class has now been preying voraciously on the middle class for the past half century—so much so that the parasite may end up killing the host. Once the upper class has pushed the entire middle class down into the lower class, it will have only itself to feed upon. We are already seeing the first stages of that.

This is precisely why the aristocracy in Western Europe backed down and gave up the fight. After the Russian Revolution, they saw they were outmatched and outflanked by the bankers and industrialists. The bankers gave them the choice of following the Romanovs or receding into the shadows, where they would play only a diversionary and functionary role.

Both the East and the West have experienced fascist takeovers, but the methods have been somewhat different. In both cases, however, the industrialists have won all the battles. In Russia they rule under the cover of a fake Marxism. In the US they rule under the cover of a Democracy that does not exist. In both places they control the masses with fatal doses of propaganda and a completely falsified history.

If you want more proof, go to the Wikipedia page titled “[Banking in Russia](#).” There are several sections, with the first section being “Soviet Period.” Here is what is in that section:

**This section is empty
you can help by adding to it.**

Do you really believe no one has tried to add anything to that section in the 13 years that Wikipedia has been up? I guess they don't want you to read about Lenin's New Economic Policy (NEP) of 1921, which even Lenin called *state capitalism*. Why would he call it that? Because it explicitly bowed to foreign investment by bankers and industrialists—the bankers and industrialists that had bankrolled him in the first place. These industrialists were already active in Russia before 1921, but in that year Lenin removed the cloak and simply admitted it. They also don't want you to read about Stalin's First Five-Year Plan, which viciously pushed industrialization on a country that didn't want it. Why? Was this industrialization done for the benefit of the proles or the bourgeoisie? Nope. It was done for the benefit of the industrialists. *That is why it is called industrialization.*

Industry may—or may not—provide products that are useful to everyone, but the industrialists don't care about that. They will just as soon push products that are harmful to everyone, and *have*. A majority of modern products are harmful to humanity and the environment, and that majority is increasing every year. But you aren't told that. You are told to buy everything that is advertised as soon as it hits the shelves, for your own greater glory. However, it isn't to your glory the products are provided, it is to the glory of the industrialists. Industrialization increases wealth disparity by moving wealth from the poor and middle classes to the upper class. This is why the upper class loves it. This

is why Lenin and Stalin viciously forced industrialization on Russians that didn't want it: it moved money out of Russia and into the pockets of foreign investors. And this industrialization didn't help Russia at all. In fact, it decimated it via mass starvation, mass murder by the government, and civil war. Almost a century later, Russia is still feeling the effects of this fascist revolution and takeover by the financiers. Russia is no more communist than the US is democratic. Both are just smokescreens for looting by the rich.

Before we move on, let's look at some photos from Marx's Wiki page.



That's a fake. The second face has been painted or pasted in. Notice the shadows on the face don't match the other face. The easiest place to see it is in the eyes.



That's also fake. The background is a total fake and the two men have been pasted into the photo of the women. Notice how Engels looks like he is standing about six feet back, while Marx is standing almost inside the lady's dress. And what is behind Marx, below the hat?



Also fake. It has been almost totally repainted, and it looks nothing like Jenny or any of her children.

I noticed immediately how few pictures or paintings there are of Marx. There are only a handful, and most of them are heavily retouched or faked. Like his finances, the pictorial history of Marx is a big lie.

Now let's move on to Marx's time with the *New York Tribune*. Wikipedia has a whole section on this, but of course it is all misdirection. Notice that it says this: Marx sought to communicate with the public by writing articles for the *New York Tribune* and other bourgeois newspapers. Did you trip over that? Aren't we taught that Marx wanted the proles to overthrow the bourgeoisie? So it should be strange to see him published in a "bourgeois" paper, no? The reason Marx was in the *Tribune* is that it was the most widely circulated paper in the US at the time, so it was the most useful as a dispenser of propaganda. However, Intelligence lost control of the paper in 1861 and had to switch their man Dana over to the *New York Sun*. Not surprisingly, Marx left at that time, too.

Wikipedia supplies proof of what I just said, but since they don't sell it as proof, most people will miss it. In the section on the *Tribune*, we find this paragraph inserted by someone:

From December 1851 to March 1852, Marx wrote *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*,^[152] a work on the *French Revolution of 1848*, in which he expanded upon his concepts of historical materialism, *class struggle* and the *dictatorship of the proletariat*, advancing the argument that victorious proletariat has to

smash the [bourgeois](#) state.^[153]

But they just admitted Marx was writing for the bourgeois *Tribune* at the same time. How does that make any sense? It makes sense only when you realize Marx was trying to turn the bourgeoisie against the proles. He had to prevent an alliance of the middle class with the lower class. So he was diverting the (semi)literate workers who read the *Tribune* away from any alliance with the factory workers, mine workers, and farm workers who probably weren't reading newspapers at all. Divide and conquer, you know.

I advise you to pause and chew on the term “dictatorship of the proletariat.” Why would Marx put it that way, if he wanted to sell the idea of a “victorious proletariat”? Aren't those two ideas contradictory? If you were a revolutionary trying to bring about the rise of the proletariat and the smashing of the bourgeois state, would you call the outcome of that *the dictatorship of the proletariat*? No, you would only call it that if you were trying to scare your bourgeois readers. They don't want a dictatorship of the proletariat, do they? No one smart enough to read the newspapers wants a dictatorship of illiterate factory workers, and Marx knew that.

In the next section at Wikipedia, we get more indication my reading of all this is correct, when we find that Marx and Engels are arguing in 1851 that another economic downturn is necessary for another revolution. Conditions had bettered somewhat after the revolutions of 1848, so Marx and Engels were arguing it wasn't the time for another uprising. They advised the other leaders to wait for another recession.

This advice was coming right out of the mouth of Marx's uncle Benny, of course, since the economic conditions had bettered somewhat only because the industrialists had loosened the vise a turn or two in response to the revolutions of 1848. The industrialists made a few minor concessions in that time, for the purpose of defusing the uprisings. It was then Marx's job to be sure the socialist leaders responded in the right way, by putting the revolution on hold.

Unfortunately, this was the opposite of what they should have done. The concessions should have been read as an indication of weakness of the upper class. If they had really been as strong as they wished to appear, they wouldn't have needed to make any concessions. The revolutions of 1848 had weakened them, and a second round of revolutions in the 1850s may have led to even greater success by the Republicans. But infiltration by Marx and others defused that possibility.

In that sense, Marxism is probably the greatest propaganda success of all time. The smashing success of this early major psy-op has led to everything we have seen since, including the sharp rise of all forms of misdirection. The upper class discovered that most people could be fooled most of the time, and that this fooling allowed for complete control of society. They have had no use for the truth since that time.

We see more proof of my reading in the beginning of the next section at Wikipedia, on the First International.

In that organisation, Marx was involved in the struggle against the [anarchist](#) wing centred on [Mikhail Bakunin](#) (1814–1876).^[139] Although Marx won this contest, the transfer of the seat of the General Council from London to New York in 1872, which Marx supported, led to the decline of the International.

Notice how Marx is able to cleverly switch gears, to respond to any immediate crisis. Earlier with the

Young Hegelians, Marx had pushed the leaders to be more radical in their attacks on Christianity, knowing this would backfire. Here, he is pushing for less radicalism. Afraid that Bakunin's group might actually do something, Marx came in and took over the First International. Notice that Marx's takeover led to *the decline of the International*. Of course it did. That is what it was meant to do.

The most important event in these years was the Paris Commune of 1871, for which Marx wrote *Der Burgerkrieg in Frankreich*. Although it was sold as support of the Communards, in fact Marx did everything possible to undercut them. For instance, we find this famous passage:

One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that the working class cannot simply lay hold of ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

There were lessons to be drawn from the failures of 1871, but I don't think that is one of them. Successful revolutionaries can lay hold of anything they have a use for, just as any conquering army can. The words above again look like the words of Uncle Benny. He is trying to convince the Republican leaders that they don't have the expertise or wherewithal to use the existing bureaucracy. But just the opposite is true. Yes, they need some sort of plan of how to use it—what to keep and what to throw out—and some people who are adept at administration. A few smart people could come up with that in a matter of weeks.

Marx is just manufacturing problems. He is trying make the revolutionaries think that revolution is so complex and requires so much intricate planning it is nigh impossible. He advises that it requires years of study and detailed maps of all actions during the transition. It doesn't. Nothing that humans do requires that, because if it did nothing would ever get done. The current bureaucracy doesn't work that way, so why would a revolutionary government have to work that way? Everything done by humans is criminally inefficient, but that doesn't stop life from moving forward. All the revolution would require is a few halfway competent people: as such, they would be half-again as competent as the people currently running things.

Wikipedia then backpedals to 1859 and the publication of *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. We are told,

Thus, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* created a storm of enthusiasm when it appeared in public. The entire edition of the book was sold out quickly.

Yes, but who bought it? The Intelligence agencies? Supposing the numbers weren't just faked, as now, selling out editions means nothing. We have seen in my previous papers the government buying hundreds of thousands of copies of F. Scott Fitzgerald and other authors and distributing them for free as part of some “wartime effort” or another. My guess is this is what happened with Marx. Do you really believe a book with the title *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* created a storm of enthusiasm with the public? Not a chance. Remember, this is where Marx hamhandedly pushed the idea of an economic interpretation of history. In other words, economics determines everything else, including the daily lives people lead. Never was a political philosophy less artistic, less religious, less colorful, less poetic, and less interesting. Compared to Marx, Adam Smith seems like a Hollywood blockbuster. Beyond that, never was a political philosophy less true. That is to say, less *historical*. Which is rich in that Marx was pushing a form of historicism.

Any study of history or the lives of real people shows that economics was and is just one consideration among many, and that it has always been considered the most vulgar and the least definitive. It

certainly wasn't the basis for all human interaction, not in tribal cultures, not in Eastern (Oriental) cultures, and not even in Western cultures up to that time. Economics has enjoyed a steep rise in relative importance in past 150 years, but that is because it has been promoted so outrageously by the same people that were promoting Marx. While they were promoting this vulgar economic reading of history, they were demoting all spiritualism, art, poetry, cooperation, and other non-economic factors, so it is no surprise to see the bookstores and libraries filled with other books in the same line as *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*—books that no one wants to read, or does read. We must assume that even the bankers don't read this crap, they simply push it on those they wish to loan money to, sell stocks to, or issue credit cards to.

If economics were so fascinating (creating a storm of enthusiasm), people would be watching TV programs and going to see movies about economists. They aren't, and never were, and never will. We may assume that economics creates some enthusiasm with accountants, but accountants aren't known for storms of enthusiasm, so even there the wording overstates the case. Most people could care less about economics, and would rather talk about anything else in the world, including athlete's foot or adult diapers. I am almost universally curious, but economics bores even me. In general, I want to know everything, but there isn't much to know about economics except that it is a bore. Some people have things to sell and other people have things they want to buy, and you just hope to get a match. Beyond that it is all a cheat and a steal and a yawn for any honest person.

This means there are no real Marxists and never have been. All prominent people⁵ pretending to be interested in Marxism, pro or con, are being paid by Intelligence one way or the other. It is all part of the magnificent con. No one you thought was a Marxist ever was, including people like Christopher Hitchens and Lyndon Larouche. That was simply a pose they were paid to take for a while. Eventually they were paid to take a different pose, like the actors they were and are.

You will say, "It can't be. There are simply too many of them—too many people who seem to take this stuff seriously. Literally tens of thousands of academics and writers would have to be part of the con. You find them at every university and college, and there are thousands of universities and colleges." Well, you simply underestimate Intelligence once again, both its size and its reach. It is indeed everywhere, and there are not just tens of thousands of these people, there are millions. [I showed in a recent paper](#) that there were at least six million of them in the US alone, and that number may be a low estimate. Since there is no real Intelligence work to be done domestically—in the sense of anti-Terrorism or things like that—most of these people are involved in the magnificent con one way or the other. Everyone in the media is part of it, and all of Hollywood, and everyone in publishing, and a large part of academia. Like Hollywood, the universities have been completely taken over, and they are all but run by these shadowy government agencies. The college Presidents and Deans come right out of Intelligence—they are actually appointed by the agencies directly, with Boards of Regents just being a smokescreen. Just study the bios of these college Presidents: like the people we outed above, their stories are full of red flags.



You will say “like who, for instance.” OK, for instance William M. Chace, who has been President at both Wesleyan and Emory, and whom I outed [in my paper on *Ramparts*](#) magazine. He wrote for *Ramparts* in the 1960s, and later won the Sidney Hook award—which should be called the spook award. Hook was career CIA, and he helped Intelligence infiltrate many literary magazines and most of their writers. This information is scrubbed from Chace's current bio, but it can be gleaned by digging a bit deeper.



As another for instance, we can go to McGeorge Bundy, whose was appointed Dean of Arts and Sciences at Harvard when he was 34. He joined OSS right of college at age 22, and they admit that. Later he was National Security Advisor to both Kennedy and Johnson, a top spook post. He didn't retire from the CIA to become Dean at Harvard. You don't move in and out of the CIA. He was CIA all along, *on assignment at Harvard*. The position of Harvard Dean is a CIA-assigned post.

Now that we know who Marx really was and what his assignment was, we can return to the mystery of Trier and New Trier high school. Are these people actually Satanists? I don't think so. I admit they use Satanism as a cover, including the 666 signal and the horn-sign and all that. But I don't believe they are actually Satanists. They are bad people, but that doesn't make them Satanists. They are bad people because they are addicted to lying and cheating and stealing, but that doesn't make them Satanists. All humans seem to have a large tolerance for lying and cheating and stealing, it is just that

these people now running the world are fabulously good at it. They have found a way to look at themselves in the mirror without getting sick, despite having achieved all they think they have achieved by lying and cheating. This makes them bad but it does not make them Satanists. Satanism would qualify as a sort of religion, and these people are deeply and profoundly irreligious. You can be sure they aren't praying to any gods or demons of any stripe, since that would require them to admit to a world beyond their shallow world of money and economics and vulgar displays of faux-power.

If they were successfully calling up gods—good or bad—we would see them with powers they do not appear to have. If they had magical powers, they wouldn't need to subsist on these vulgar conjobs. It is unlikely the gods would stoop to lying right to our stupid faces, since that lacks all subtlety and refinement. Only those with no magical powers at all would need to use the sort of schoolyard tricks we see them using. Only those with no magical powers and no charisma of any kind would need to stoop to using guns—which are of course the real source of power with these people. Those who had successfully called up the demons of the Earth would be far more beguiling than these plastic people we now see in the media—and these plastic people are actually chosen for their charm. Compared to the people who are hiding behind them, they really are princes and princesses.



But just think of someone like Anderson Cooper—put him in your mind's eye with me. This is who they chose as their front man. In rummaging through all the old families, Cooper was the most charismatic and charming person they could find. That by itself tells you a lot about these old families. No family that had a direct line to a demon would need to lead with Anderson Cooper. They could call up a figment of Ares or Aphrodite to charm you into submission.

So why the Black Gate? Why the link to Assyria? Why the 666 and the fire worship? Because they would rather you link them to Assyria and Satan than that you figure out the truth: it is all Intelligence. Just as Hogwarts is a school for witches, New Trier is a school for young agents. It is the CIA's own prep school, or one of them (Hotchkiss in Connecticut is another). Having no use for Satanism, the CIA has coopted its signs and signals as a convenience. This serves double duty, since most normal people aren't familiar with these signs, or sidle away from them nervously. Intelligence is then free to wink and nudge itself all it wants, with no fear of being decoded. But it also serves as misdirection, since some researchers will not sidle away. They will see the signs and read them as Satanic. This suits Intelligence fine, since it acts as another layer of confusion. Researchers have lost decades

following these fake clues to Satanism.

However, the shorter link between Trier and New Trier is no accident or misdirection. The high school really *is* paying homage to one of its own. Karl Marx is one of the high saints of propaganda, a hidden agent of the highest order. But New Trier high school couldn't very well put a picture of Karl Marx on its emblem, could it? Most people would read that as "we are Communists," rather than the correct reading, which is "we are agents like Marx."

*We now begin to understand more about Hoving, and his motivation for bastardizing and vulgarizing the MMA. See my initial commentary on Hoving in [my paper called "The Mona Lisa Curse."](#)

**See [my paper on the Bikini Atoll](#) for the key to this.

†This may explain his editorial choices. See my [letters to the editor](#), where I complain of his promotion of faux-feminism.

‡Published pictures do not confirm this, but she was attractive enough not to hang around with boys.

⁵Some Marxists are no doubt earnest, but that would just make them dupes rather than plants.

⁶Is Sacha Baron Cohen (Borat) from this family? Hard to prove, but I assume yes. His genealogy is scrubbed, hitting weirdness on his grandfather's page, where his grandfather is a Baron Cohen, but his great-grandfather is a Baron. The Cohen is dropped for no reason and against all logic. This also conflicts with his Wiki page, which tells us the grandfather added the "Baron". No, [according to Geni](#), he added the "Cohen". Why would he do that?